

### **REMARKS**

Applicant has reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated October 28, 2008. Claims 1-8 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 4, 6 and 7 are amended as set forth above. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added with the amendments. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in accordance with the following remarks.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. While Applicant respectfully traverses the § 112 rejections, Applicant has amended the independent claims to further clarify the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

First, the Office Action alleges that “[i]t is not clear if objects represent corresponding components in the first computer, the first application or both.” Office Action, ¶ 9, p. 4. Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that the “first application relates objects representing corresponding components.” As such, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this § 112, second paragraph rejection.

Next, the Office Action alleges that the elements of “the type hierarchy” and “the object hierarchy” contain insufficient antecedent basis. While Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and asserts that a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand the meaning of the elements based on the specification and claim language, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 4, 6 and 7 to further prosecution by providing additional antecedent basis for the elements “the type hierarchy” and “the object hierarchy.” Based on the clarifying amendments, Applicant respectfully asserts that the present claims provide sufficient antecedent basis to satisfy § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejections with regards to “the type hierarchy” and “the object hierarchy.”

The Office Action further alleges that it is not clear whether “the type chain and object chain are provided by the first computer or the message generator,” or whether “the chains are provided to the message or if the message includes the chains and the message is provided to

some other entity.” Office Action, ¶ 10, p. 4-5. Again, while Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection based on the understanding a person of ordinary skill in the art would have in light of the specification and claim language, Applicant has amended the claim in order to further prosecution. Specifically, Claim 1 as amended now recites that the “message generator [is] further operable to provide to the second computer a message comprising a type chain...and an object chain.” Based on the amendment, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph rejection with regard to the message generator.

Next, the Office Action alleges that “it is not clear what is being claimed by reciting the type chain and the object chain.” Office Action, ¶ 11, p. 5. Applicant respectfully traverses the § 112 rejection, but has amended Claim 1 to further clarify the type chain and the object chain. For example, amended Claim 1 recites that the “message compris[es] a type chain identifying a path in the type hierarchy in a parent-child direction and an object chain identifying a path in the object hierarchy in the parent-child direction, wherein the type chain identifies a type node associated with a target object and the object chain identifies an object node associated with the target object, wherein a combination of the type node and the object node identifies the target object that corresponds to the target component.” Applicant submits that amended Claim 1 sufficiently and particularly points out and distinctly claims “type chain” and “object chain” such that a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand what is being claimed. Similar amendments were made to Claims 4, 6 and 7 to address the Office Action’s concerns. Based on these amendments, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph rejection with regards to the “type chain” and “object chain” elements of the independent claims.

Finally, the Office Action alleges that it is not clear what is meant by the claim element of “...provide identification of the target component with type and object as well as identification of the parent components with types and objects,” and specifically, that it is not clear “what is meant by the recited type and object.” Office Action, ¶ 12, p. 5. While again, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the claims. Amended Claim 1 now recites that the “message interpreter [is] operable to parse both chains to provide identification of the target component with the combination of the type node and the object node as well as to provide identification of the parent components with the

combination of ascendants of the type node and ascendants of the object node.” In other words, the message interpreter identifies the target component using the combination of the type node and object node identified in the message providing the type and object defining the target component. Claims 4, 6 and 7 have been similarly amended to further clarify the subject matter recited by the claims. Thus, based on the amendments provided above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph rejections described in ¶ 12 of the Office Action.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-4 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,895,586 to Brasher *et al.* (“*Brasher*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,345,245 to Sugiyama *et al.* (“*Sugiyama*”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the reasons set forth below.

For example, independent Claim 1 recites, in part, a first application that “relates objects representing corresponding components in both a type hierarchy identifying types of components and a separate object hierarchy identifying information associated with objects.” In particular, the first application relates objects in both a type hierarchy and an object hierarchy, wherein the two hierarchies are explicitly separate from one another. In contrast, *Brasher* merely teaches a single hierarchical namespace that is implemented over multiple computers such as in an enterprise network. *See Brasher*, col. 3, line 61- col. 4, line 7. Using this single hierarchical namespace, common attributes and attribute types for objects are defined for all computers in the system. *See id.* at col. 15, lines 61-66.

Put simply, *Brasher* fails to teach a type hierarchy and a separate object hierarchy. As specifically pointed out in the Office Action, *Brasher* teaches a hierarchical namespace and a schema hierarchy that is a part of the larger hierarchical namespace. *See Office Action*, ¶ 4, p. 3 (citing *Brasher*, col. 15, lines 60-64; col. 16, lines 27-33). At best, *Brasher* indicates that the schema hierarchy is not identical to the namespace, but instead merely a branch, or portion, of the namespace. *Brasher*, col. 16, lines 27-30 (“...schema objects may be maintained under a

‘schema’ branch 472 off the root 470 of a local namespace”).<sup>1</sup> Thus, under its broadest reading possible, *Brasher* still merely teaches a first hierarchy and second hierarchy, wherein the second hierarchy is only a portion of the first hierarchy. Thus, *Brasher* does not teach or suggest a type hierarchy separate from the object hierarchy as recited in Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, *Brasher* fails to teach or suggest each and every claim element of independent Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that *Sugiyama* fails to account for at least the identified deficiencies of *Brasher*, and, accordingly, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 1 and its dependents. Further, independent Claims 4, 6 and 7 recite elements that analogous to those of Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 4, 6 and 7 (as well as their dependents) are allowable for at least the same reasons as those discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brasher* in view of *Sugiyama* as applied to Claim 4 above, and further in view of the article entitled “Computer Networks,” Third Edition, Prentice Hall, PTR by Andrew S. Tanenbaum (“*Tanenbaum*”). As shown above, the *Brasher-Sugiyama* combination fails to teach or suggest each and every element of Claim 4 as amended. Further, Applicant asserts that it has also at least not been shown that *Tanenbaum* remedies at least the identified deficiencies of the *Brasher-Sugiyama* combination used to reject Claim 4. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the *Brasher-Sugiyama-Tanenbaum* combination fails to teach or disclose each and every element of independent Claim 4, and thus, dependent Claim 5. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 103 rejection, as well as reconsideration and allowance of Claim 5.

---

<sup>1</sup> Similarly, *Brasher* describes an agent namespace as “one branch of a hierarchical, enterprise-wide namespace.” *Id.* at col. 11, lines 35-39.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. Applicant notes that the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all claims.

If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicant hereby requests a telephone conference with the Examiner and further requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

Applicant believes no fees to be due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 27, 2009

/Michael E. Cox/

Michael E. Cox  
Reg. No. 47,505

**PTO Customer No. 32864**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1717 Main Street, Suite 5000  
Dallas, TX 75201  
Telephone: (214) 747-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945